

aram shumavon
221 Scott Street
San Francisco CA 94117

Sep 5th 2018

Via ECFS
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to
47 U.S.C. Section 160(c); WC Docket No. 18-141; Category 1**

Dear FCC,

As a creator of American jobs as a small business owner, as a former regulator who has worked directly on Unbundled Network Elements ("UNEs"), as a customer of provider of UNEs (AT&T), as a customer of third party provider that utilizes UNEs (Sonic), and as a market design economist with more than twenty years of experience on issues related to availability, accessibility, and pricing of legacy infrastructure related to natural monopolies, I am uniquely positioned to speak directly on the issues before the Commission related to potential forbearance under Section 251(c)(3). I urge you to disregard USTelecom's claim that the residential market will not be materially affected by forbearance. That claim is erroneous as a matter of fact and false as a matter of market design. If the Commission continues to believe in the markets envisioned by the 1996 Communications Act, it must recognize that capital is being deployed actively to obviate the need for UNEs over time and that the proposed forbearance is designed to make a regulatory end run around those still maturing, infrastructure-based markets.

Very real companies (e.g. my provider, Sonic) and very real customers (e.g. me) utilize this infrastructure now. Sonic is actively building fiber networks to compete against incumbent carriers. I can personally assure you that I regularly and frequently check Sonic's progress toward supplying fiber to my premises and that they are making progress but are not there (or here, as the case may be) yet. Should the Commission forbear under 251(c)(3) it will, as a matter of economic theory and practice, materially harm the very competitive market envisioned under the 1996 Communications Act which are in active development consistent with the intent of the 1996 Act. Infrastructure based markets take a long time to mature. This is especially the case in highly regulated, dense, urban environments where equipment trenching is necessary. The capital necessary to support such infrastructure investments is significant and the ability to access credit facilities depend on revenue streams from customers like me that are directly dependent on continued access to UNEs.

Additionally, I can assure you the quality of service I receive from Sonic is much, much higher than the quality of service I receive from AT&T. This includes both the accessibility and responsiveness of the provider and the DSL service itself. Please do not lose sight of the significance of this fact. AT&T's business units are many and their diversity is astounding. With revenues of over \$100B in 2017 and hundreds of thousands of additional customers being added to services like video in Latin

America, this is hardly a surprising fact. Sonic is multiple orders of magnitude smaller. With no access to public market capital they have to rely on customer revenue in a way that is simply not applicable to the incumbents' revenue streams. This translates into higher quality service that directly affects me. It also directly affects my connectivity to my company and our ability to continue to expand operations and hire more employees. These internet services are not just crucial to our business, they are crucial to our economy as a nation.

I urge the Commission to carry forward with a regulatory framework consistent with the original intent of the 1996 Act and continue to make UNEs available at cost of service rates.

aram shumavon